Department of the Navy

SPS Performance Support Forum

SPAWAR Systems Center

San Diego, California

May 18, 1999, 1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

This Forum was the second held on the road and was hosted by SPAWAR Systems Center, San Diego during the v4.1.a Deployment Assessment. The meeting was conducted via VTC and those sites participating included the Washington Forum members, NAVAIR Pax River, and SPAWAR Charleston. In addition, a number of local activities, BUMED, USMC, and SPAWAR personnel in the San Diego area attended the Forum in San Diego along with personnel from NAVAIR, NAVSEA, MSC, NAVFAC and ONR who were participating in the Deployment Assessment.

Welcome

1) Ms. Mary Jo Johnson thanked everyone for coming to the Regional Performance Support Group and introductions commenced. Ms. Johnson stated the San Diego Users Group was the first Regional Performance Group and it is was the cornerstone for the additional groups being formed around the country. She thanked Deborah Conti for her leadership in establishing the San Diego group.

2) Ms. Deborah Conti, SPAWAR, informed the Group (and passed out material) that she received from AMS providing the data elements that clauses pull from. **ACTION: CMO to distribute copies to all CIMB and PSF members and Ms. Conti to ask AMS if they can put this on the AMS web site.** SPAWAR is using this material to develop a cheat sheet for contracting personnel that indicates which data elements they will need to fill in for contracts. Ms. Deborah O'Rourke, NAVFAC, stated that this clause logic information would be very important for both Upgrade sites as well as New Install sites when they import existing contracts into SPS. Ms. Jan Gosnell, SPAWAR, stated that she has reviewed the document and developed a 2-page

Planned Deployment / Installations

1) Ms. Mary Jo Johnson stated that three deployments are scheduled in May (NAVFAC HQ and Chesapeake Division, BUMED NMLC Frederick), along with eight Upgrades in June (MSC HQ, NAWC-China Lake, NAVSEA NSWC Dahlgren, BUMED Bethesda, Portsmouth, San Diego, and NAVFAC Atlantic Division and the Public Work Center Norfolk.)

2) Ms. Johnson stated that lessons learned from the earlier installs would be important to those sites with future deployments. She noted all will be kept apprised of lessons learned as we proceed through the install. It was noted that the passwords and user IDs should be provided to AMS in advance of their visit and checked before AMS leaves . Both NAVFAC HQ and BUMED NMLC Frederick experienced problems related to AMS setting/checking these items.

Upgrade Status

1) Ms. Jan Gosnell, SPAWAR, stated that she has been working with AMS on testing various items and some items require more specific answers and documentation from AMS. Ms. Gosnell noted two in particular. (1) Installing on a network and (2) EDA Server.

2) Ms. Gosnell stated that script #14 of the MOS tests the EDA and testing this with the test database in a non-operational environment is not adequate testing. Ms. Gosnell recommended that each site determine how they want to install and use EDA and the AMS documentation should be site specific. Testing EDA is in the Measures of Success and Ms. Gosnell suggested it be tested at the end when AMS is still on-site. **ACTION: CMO to get the word to all sites.** It was agreed that testing the EDA server must be accomplished before a site signs-off on the Measures of Success.

3) Mr. John Forbes, AIES, suggested using a PDF Writer to create a postscript file with an automatic conversion to a PDF vs. using Adobe Exchange to manually create a PDF from the postscript file produced by PD2**. ACTION: Ms. Gosnell to test using a PDF Writer vs. Adobe Exchange**.

4) Mr. Scott Raley, NAVAIR, stated that during the Operational Assessment of v4.1 at Pax River, the EDA server was tested by changing the configuration file on the EDA server and pointing the test database to the EDA Server. This was set-up by an AMS

is not in the Knowledge Base yet. **Action: Ms. Gosnell to provide her comments to the CIMB, and to the PMO/ AMS.**

6) Ms. Gosnell stated that she has been working with Matt Maginniss and John Sirmon of PricewaterhouseCoopers on the vendor database script and it is working fine. AMS has posted the 2 prepared scripts on the AMS Knowledge Base (6049). Ms. Johnson recommended that all install/upgrade sites for v4.1.a begin to pull these down and get prepared.

7) Ms. Deborah O'Rourke asked if the tool were ready that would load the vendor information back into the database after it is received from CCR. Ms. Johnson stated that after careful review, this was determined to be risky, because the vendor status will be either all "Approved" or "Unapproved". Many activities have hundreds of vendors such as NAVFAC and NAVSEA and the risks of automatically loading the CCR data may be greater than manually checking the vendor status and making the necessary changes**.** Ms Gosnell concurred that using an auto-loading script could be a high-risk solution.   Mary Jo Johnson will work with NAVSEA and NAVFAC to determine the best solution for their sites as the NAVSEA and NAVFAC representatives indicated that many of them have large vendor lists. **ACTION: Ms. Gosnell will review the process using a tool to input the data from CCR back into the vendor database to determine the risk factor**.

8) Ms. Deborah Conti, SPAWAR, stated the client machines at SPAWAR were installed via a Network Installer and after testing mods to existing contracts, reviewing existing contracts, and a GSA Order, no problems were found**. ACTION: Ms. Conti to distribute to CIMB and PSF members the process for the Network Install**. **ACTION: All Claimants to provide a list to the CMO** (steven.busch@us.pwcglobal.com) **indicating which sites will need to do a Network Install**. AMS will consider adding Network Install to the Measures of Success. Ms. Johnson recommended that all sites with a network test actions form network clients as part of the Measures of Success.

9) Mr. Dave Kemp, AMS, discussed an important install issue from the Deployment Assessment. He stated that as part of the SPAWAR install they had made modifications to the Sybase parameters that reduced the number of deadlocks. After the first day of testing.   He noted that these are in addition to those suggestions in the ATP. It was requested and he agreed to this **action: AMS will modify the install package to include additional recommendations for improved SPS performance**.

2) Ms. Johnson stated that a timeline of activities required for a successful upgrade has been developed recently. **Action: It will be posted on the Navy Web Site to help sites prepare.**

3) Ms. O'Rourke asked that all past and current v4.1 / v4.1a installs be notified of the Sybase tuning recommendations to improve performance. **ACTION: Dave Kemp to talk to Jill Fernald to notify all past and current installs of Sybase tuning recommendations**.

4) Ms. O'Rourke recommended sites invest in the up front work to be prepared for the Upgrade. Particularly sites should:

   - Update Contracts
   - Update and Prepare database
   - Update both vendor and organization files

5) Ms Johnson stated that the CMO will keep claimants and sites informed of lessons learned during the initial installs. This is a primary purpose of the Performance Support Group concept.

Local Clause Installer

1) Ms. Diane Lucas stated that the Local Clause Installer is going to be reviewed by the Requirements Board. A site would be able to load it after an Upgrade but before the site becomes operational. Ms. Lucas indicated that this may be separate from the PD2 program and therefore may not need to be included with an SPS release. **ACTION: Mr. Dave Kemp to notify the Navy as to the deployment options for the Local Clause Installer**.

Deployment Assessment

1) Mr. Eugene Toni thanked all the deployment assessment participants and summarized the actions of the assessment thus far. 17 scripted contract actions were tested. Some were ½-hour tests; some were 6-hour tests. Scripts were run more than once. A list of capabilities in the current and future versions was distributed to the testers prior to the assessment so the testers were aware of the current functionality.

2) 36 Issues arose during the tests. 19 were turned over to the AMS Help Desk for

took 4 minutes to process the second took 8 minutes. The physical results of the documents were identical. Additionally, the same test was done with four testers and the results were (4 min / 8 min / 12 min / 16 min) to completely process the documents due to the queuing process, resulting from the Sybase edits made by AMS - however there were no page locks. Four different contract types were tested with similar results. A 100 line item contract took 5 ½ minutes to process. A 20 line, fixed price, cost plus and 4 option year contract also took 5 ½ minutes. The next test will include 1000 line items. It was noted that if running Windows NT, users could work outside of PD2 while the contracts are in queue to be processed.

5) AMS reminded members present that each server site should have at least one person trained in Sybase.

6) Ms. Johnson stated that the PMO would like each claimant to develop a list of deployment criteria, prioritizing the desired functions. Ms. Johnson stated that the PMO wanted to review this in light of possibly reconsidering the priorities in the release of future versions.

7) Ms. Conti asked, "At what number of users does performance begin to degrade?" Mr. Toni said they would see if the system administrators would be able to determine that from the test data.

8) Mr. Scott Raley stated that NAVAIR Pax River will perform a stress test with 500 users. He added the results would be distributed to all claimants.

9) Mr. Toni reminded PSF members that the Clause Generation function, which will provide users with an option to close and save the document without reselecting clauses, is currently scheduled for Version 4.1.c. This function will aid performance.

10) Ms. O'Rourke asked if the stress test of 25 concurrent users has been completed. Mr. Toni indicated that this was not scheduled to be tested. Ms. O'Rourke was emphatic that this is an important test for her activities, because the performance issues could drain sites productivity, and that this test had been planned to be included in the Assessment and had been requested since day one. Mr. Toni agreed to conduct the test after the discussion.

11) Ms. Conti stated that all the SPS client PCs were upgrade prior to the testing and this could have improved the performance during testing that can not duplicated in all

Knowledge Management

1) Mr. John Rannenberg, PricewaterhouseCoopers, presented the knowledge management objective on behalf of Mr. Chuck Mills. The concept will formalize a platform to SPS users to have the information they need to attain Full Operational Capability using PD2.

2) Mr. Rannenberg stated that the presentation will be shared with the Washington DC focus group the following week to further refine the strategy with continued refinement throughout the month. Gathering data will follow.

3) The technology to present the information to the users could possibly use an existing web site as a base.

4) Mr Rannenberg stated that teams will be established to gather information and execute the plan.
    a. Focus Group Strategy: site visits by CMO representatives to gather data.
    b. Focus Group Key Elements: what information/data is important at a point in time.
    c. Focus Group/Go To Team:
        - An avenue to help get the knowledge out within the Focus Group. Part of a multi pronged approach.
        - Gather and distill knowledge relevant to users community. Don't want to clutter with non-relevant issues.
        - Review and reissue.
        - Quality control.
        - Metrics to measure its value.
        - Delivery: information will be physically shared.
    d. Focus Program Sharing Culture: keep structure simple

5) Metrics will be developed to validate the approach to disseminating knowledge to determine if the delivery, the physical sharing of the information, matches users desired learning style.

6) Presentation to follow.

Local Issues

a. Scrub vendor files; they had over 1700 vendors.
b. Ensure all contracts have DD350s.
c. Upgraded their server.
d. Tested system administration issues with satellite sits.
e. Worked several issues with clause logic. It pulled in too many clauses and they had many local clauses. They created their own clause logic but are hoping the 4.1.a upgrade and the clause logic paper from AMS will help resolve these concerns.
f. They have had only 1 or 2 lockups since March but only run one application at a time on the clients.

2) BUMED NMC San Diego stated that page locking sounded like the biggest concern to their users. This is due to the fact that their work in the hospital environment requires immediate processing of procurement transactions. They would be severely impacted if the work could not be processed. Ms. Diane Lucas stated that some sites that are really using PD2 heavily are starting to experience page locking, such as FISC Puget Sound.

3) Mr. John Forbes stated that setting page size in Sybase is a performance / page locking tradeoff. Page locking can be reduced, but performance would also degrade. Mr. Forbes asked if this trade-off could be tested in the Deployment Assessment.

4) Ms. Conti stated that the SPAWAR Upgrade went very well, and she believed AMS sent their best installers. It was noted that this Upgrade needs to be documented well and shared with all sites. In addition, it was agreed that the Navy knowledge is growing and the Navy users are starting to drive the process with the strong functional experience and growing application knowledge.

Microsoft Update Data Call

1) Ms. Johnson stated that the DLA Microsoft Product Data Call was incomplete. The Navy is attempting to get more information about the Microsoft options.

2) One question is whether the software can be obtained at any time, or must it coincide with an install or an upgrade.

3) A new data call will be distributed to the Claimants with the options. AMS recommends that PD2 runs best on Windows NT. Windows NT allows multi tasking

2) Ms. O'Rourke attended the class and informed the Forum that the class would have been more effective if it had been taught from a PD2 database instead of a commercial sales catalog. The class was able to write adhoc reports, but the catalog is lacking a number of basic contracting data fields. As a result, NAVFAC HQ is giving a list of its needed elements to the PMO with the intention of getting the items added to the catalog. NAVFAC is planning on developing as many standard reports to be distributed nation wide to all their sites to enhance the standard reports that come with the SPS Product.

3) Some of the product issues encountered during the course included the Impromptu Report Writer allows you to cross-folders, but the SPS product does not. The DD350 Power Cube was reviewed in class but does not display well for the general users. How to create a Power Cube should be added to the course material. The material does provide guidance on how to download the Power Cube from the AMS Web site. Overall, the documentation was good, but 1-day was not enough time for the users to write reports using the PD2 catalog. Recommend that the entire course be taught against the PD2 catalog using exercising and class demonstrations, this will enable users to retain the information easier going against a system catalog that they understand.